



Hood Canal Coordinating Council
Richard Brocksmitth, Lead Entity Coordinator
richardbrocksmitth@earthlink.net
P.O. Box 670
Seabeck, Washington 98380-0670

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
PHASE I: PREAPPLICATION	3
PHASE II: TECHNICAL REVIEW & RANKING	5
PHASE III: HPLC REVIEW & FINAL RANKING	6
PHASE IV: HCCC ADMINISTRATION	7
PHASE V: SRFB REVIEW AND FUNDING	7
APPENDIX A: 2006 LEAD ENTITY TIMELINE	8
APPENDIX B: PROPOSED TECHNICAL TEAM EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR 7TH ROUND (2006)	9
APPENDIX C: 2004 SRFB TECHNICAL CRITERIA	10
APPENDIX D: PROPOSED HABITAT PROJECT LIST COMMITTEE EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR 7TH ROUND (2006)	13
APPENDIX E: 2006 LEAD ENTITY GROUNDRULES	14
APPENDIX F: 6TH ROUND LEAD ENTITY PARTICIPANTS	18

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The following Process Guide is an illustration of the Hood Canal Coordinating Council (HCCC) Lead Entity¹ procedure for developing projects and forwarding to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) for review and funding. The Guide incorporates the recommendations of the consensus body lead entity members into each phase of the local process for the 7th round SRFB grant cycle. A significant change adopted by the Salmon Recovery Funding Board to be performed by lead entities is the implementation of ESA salmon recovery plans, which in our region exist for chinook and summer chum salmon and bull trout. This change is less important in our region given that the HCCC Salmon Habitat Recovery Strategy formed the basis for the voluntary habitat portions of the salmon recovery plans.

This Process Guide serves as a reference that will assist all Lead Entity participants (project sponsors, committee members, staff, etc.) throughout the process, from project development to final presentation to the SRFB.

The local process is divided into five phases that include preapplication, technical review and ranking, citizen review and ranking, HCCC administration, and SRFB review and funding. The following describes each of these phases, and what participants can expect. This information may be supplemented by additional material once the 7th funding round begins. The Appendices in this Guide represent current and previous decisions that together strive to make the local process as effective and efficient as possible in light of the continuing recognition of the need for salmon recovery, yet decreasing fiscal resources for that effort.

PHASE I: PREAPPLICATION

Timeline

A timeline is extremely important to establish early in a funding process. Appendix A includes the proposed 2006 timeline for the 7th round grant cycle.

The SRFB has adopted the 7th round grant cycle policy manual and application materials, marking the beginning of the grant cycle. These materials are available on their website <http://www.iac.wa.gov/srfb/docs.htm>. The SRFB will require a final project list from each lead entity by September 18, 2006, and will decide on final funding on December 6 and 7, 2006.

Process Review and Update

The local process, committees, groundrules, criteria, etc. documented within this Process Guide have been developed through multiple years of collaborative

¹ Pursuant to Chapter 77.85 RCW and SRFB policies, all projects seeking SRFB funds must be reviewed and prioritized by a lead entity group in order to be considered for funding by the SRFB.

efforts of interested participants. All members of the Lead Entity are requested to attend each meeting so that we can reach consensus on updated iterations of this Process Guide and continue essential discussions on other pending regional issues, including Lead Entity integration with the implementation of ESA salmon recovery plans. The Summer Chum Salmon Recovery Plan, version 11-2005, is available from the Lead Entity website <http://www.hccc.wa.gov>. A final version of this Process Guide will be posted on the HCCC website before final applications are accepted.

During this phase, the Lead Entity will advertise for and select the participants for their role on the Technical Team (Phase II – Technical Review and Ranking) and the Habitat Project List Committee (Phase III – HPLC Review and Final Ranking).

Ranking Criteria and Groundrules

The technical criteria (Appendix B) were developed from 4th, 5th, and 6th round local criteria and SRFB's revised criteria for benefits to salmon and certainty of success for the 5th round (Appendix C). The Habitat Project List Committee evaluation and ranking criteria are presented in Appendix D. The Lead Entity established groundrules for the 5th round to which all parties must agree (Appendix E), or change through a consensus process for the 6th round. Changes to the groundrules can only be made via consensus of all participants.

Preapplications and Final Applications

The project proponents will submit preapplications by August 11 to the HCCC as the Lead Entity. The official SRFB application for the 7th round funding cycle (<http://www.iac.wa.gov/srfb/docs.htm>) will serve as the local preapplication, with the additional flexibility to add more information and detail than allowed in the official application. This will promote information sharing and project development, while minimizing any duplicative effort by project proponents in filling out applications.

Final applications are due August 30 to HCCC. It is important to remember when assembling final applications that they should be thorough and as accurate as possible as they are a significant portion of the informational material the SRFB and state Review Panel will initially have to assess the merits of each application (although State Review Panel members will also be present for the workshops).

Workshops



After project proponents submit preapplications, the Lead Entity will hold a one day project development workshop. The final schedule will be established once preapplications have been submitted. The workshops will consist of presentations from prospective project proponents on the goals, details, and merits of their proposal. We will also work that day to continue

to provide specific recommendations about what priorities and needs should be pursued for the final application submittal. It is our intent to provide a list of final applications to meet the allocation funding target approved by SRFB for the 7th round (\$940,000), while advancing only critical projects that are ready for implementation.

Field tours may be scheduled for a later date as well. Some projects, such as assessments, may not benefit from a field visit and will be excluded unless there is a special request by the project proponent to visit the site.

PHASE II: TECHNICAL REVIEW & RANKING

Technical Team Participation

Technical Team members are identified in Phase I, selected from the surrounding communities with specific technical expertise related to salmon habitat recovery such as planning, hydrology, biology and other scientific concentrations. Technical Team members **cannot** also sit on the HPLC. The list of all local participants from the 6th round is included as Appendix F. An updated roster for the 7th round will be finalized in August and provided to the lead entity and SRFB/WDFW. SRFB Review Panel members, and Puget Sound Technical Review Team members will be invited to participate on the Technical Team to facilitate an integrated review of projects and their fit to the salmon recovery plans.

Once official SRFB applications are submitted to the Lead Entity, they are distributed to each of the Technical Team and HPLC members. Technical Team members are also provided a score sheet based on the technical evaluation criteria (Appendix B). Technical Team members score projects **independently** with pre-determined technical criteria for the 7th round on the basis of the information provided in the SRFB applications. Technical criteria from the SRFB for the 5th round are provided in Appendix C.

Technical Team Meeting Structure

All individual scores are submitted to the Lead Entity Technical Team Chairperson and Lead Entity Coordinator, and all scores are normalized to present an *initial* ranking of projects for the Technical Team to use as a basis for their discussions at a formal Team meeting. Comments are considered at the meeting only from those Technical Team members who scored projects. Furthermore, no comments are accepted from Technical Team members who do not attend the meeting.

The Technical Team discusses the merits of each project, then the list in its entirety. Some projects may be moved up or down on the list based only on

technical criteria. At the end of the meeting, the Technical Team will present a final technical ranked list of projects that is forwarded to the HPLC for their consideration and final ranking. Although HPLC members are strongly encouraged to attend to improve their technical understanding, it is not required, and a summary of the meeting will be forwarded to the HPLC members. A list of Technical Team recommendations to the project sponsors will be included in the meeting summary. These recommendations are elective, not mandatory, but are believed to be in the best interest of the projects.

The meeting is open to the public, and a period for public comment is reserved at the end of the meeting for those wishing to address the Technical Team directly. The Technical Team will not respond directly to any comments at the meeting, but comments will be included as part of the meeting summary.

PHASE III: HPLC REVIEW & FINAL RANKING

HPLC Composition

The Habitat Project List Committee is comprised of citizen members from the surrounding communities with an interest in salmon habitat and recovery projects, as well as one representative from each of the project sponsors submitting applications during the funding round. No Technical Team members are allowed to participate or vote on the HPLC. However, they may be present to provide technical input if asked, or to clarify inaccurate information. The list of all local participants from the 6th round is included as Appendix F. As with the Technical Team roster, the 7th round HPLC roster will be finalized in August and provided to the lead entity and SRFB/WDFW at that time.

HPLC Meeting Structure

The HPLC will review all projects prior to and after the Technical Team meeting. At the HPLC meeting, the members will use the technical list as a starting point to determine the final ranked list. HPLC members will use a separate set of ranking criteria (Appendix D) that is based on social and economic factors, and does not reconsider any technical aspects of a project.

HPLC members must use the criteria as a reference when recommending a change in the order of the initial ranked list. The final ranked list is forwarded to the SRFB with all final project applications, and the Lead Entity application packet. All Lead Entity participants will receive a summary of the HPLC meeting proceedings.

PHASE IV: HCCC ADMINISTRATION

During this phase, the Lead Entity will review all final applications, check for errors and ensure applications are complete (i.e. signatures, photos, maps). Paper copies will be kept at the HCCC offices, while electronic copies will be submitted online via SRFB's Project Information System (PRISM). The Lead Entity will complete a SRFB application packet that summarizes the nature of the projects submitted to the SRFB from the Lead Entity, and addresses the project list's fit to the salmon recovery plans. The Lead Entity will also respond to the Review Panel's draft reports, and prepare a presentation to the SRFB and regional bodies based on the Board's specific requirements.

Authority to Remove Projects from the List

The Lead Entity has the authority to remove projects from the list that do not meet eligibility requirements for SRFB funding.² In addition, SRFB has a new policy that lead entities should only submit projects that "the lead entity wants to be evaluated for funding consideration." This fact, taken together with SRFB's increasing focus on ESA-listed fish/salmon recovery plans and the evaluation/funding criteria from SRFB Manual Appendix D that provides for ratings based on lists addressing only high priority actions/areas, may lead to culling lower priority projects from the project list before it is submitted as final to SRFB's project information system (PRISM).

PHASE V: SRFB REVIEW AND FUNDING

In the final phase of the HCCC funding process, the Lead Entity Coordinator and Technical Team Chairperson will present to the SRFB Review Panel or regional bodies as needed to answer any clarifying questions or address requests for more information. All are welcome to participate in the two-day final SRFB public meeting in December 2006, but attendance is not required.

At that meeting, the SRFB will hear testimony from the Lead Entities and regional bodies on the first day, and make final funding decisions on the second day. The Lead Entity will provide a summary of the proceedings to all Lead Entity participants.



² RCW 77.85.050 and 77.85.130.

APPENDIX A: 2006 Lead Entity Timeline

2006 PROPOSED HCCC LEAD ENTITY PROCESS SCHEDULE

— - Meeting
— - Deadline

- August 11** – Pre-applications due to HCCC via electronic submission
- August 14** – Pre-applications distributed to TAG and HPLC members
- August 17** – Proposed project presentations to HCCC Lead Entity, including TAG and HPLC members
- August** – Revisions to projects based on local, state, and regional input; HCCC TAG available for technical assistance and consultation on strategy fit
- August 30** – Final SRFB 6th round applications due to HCCC via electronic email submission and to SRFB via PRISM submission
- August 31** – Final applications distributed to TAG and HPLC members
- September 1 to 8** – HCCC TAG individually review and score each project application while HPLC reviews projects and HPLC criteria
- September 8** – HCCC TAG scores due to TAG Chair and LE Coordinator
- September 11** – HCCC TAG meeting to review projects and complete preliminary ranked project list (also open to HPLC)
- September 11** – Distribute preliminary ranked list and supporting documents from the HCCC TAG to the HPLC
- September 14, evening?** – HPLC meeting to review projects and develop final ranked project list
- September 15 to 18** – HCCC administrative processing and submittal package preparation
- September 18** – Final project submittal package due to SRFB by HCCC; Project sponsors responsible for final application updates to SRFB's PRISM
- September 30** – Regional funding recommendations
- October 20** – SRFB Review Panel project evaluation reports due
- November 6** – Review Panel and SRFB staff draft report due
- November 20 to 30** – Public comment period
- December 6 and 7, 2006** – SRFB funding decisions at public meeting; HCCC presentation and testimony

APPENDIX B: Proposed Technical Team Evaluation Criteria for 7th Round (2006)

Hood Canal Coordinating Council – Salmon Recovery Lead Entity Technical Evaluation Criteria

Proposed for 6th Round Salmon Recovery Funding Board
Version 3.20.2004

- Tiering and Priority Action Areas (30 points possible)
 - T1 + P1 or Nearshore P1 = 30 points
 - T2 + P1 or Nearshore P2 = 25 point
 - T1 + P2 or Nearshore P3 = 20 points
 - T2 + P2 = 15 points
 - T3 + P2 = 10 points
 - All other = 5 points
- Presence on the potential project lists developed for salmon recovery plans (5 points possible)
 - Presence in the plans = 5 points
 - Absence in the plans = 0 points
- Benefit to Salmon (30 points possible, up to 5 points for each criteria)
 - SRFB definition of high, medium, and low benefits
 - Project scale is appropriate/sufficient
 - Project addresses key limiting factors
 - Protects or restores natural functions and processes
 - Integration or association with other salmon recovery projects and assessments in the watershed
 - Duration of biological benefits
- Certainty of Success (30 points possible, up to 6 points for each criteria)
 - SRFB definition of high, medium, and low certainty
 - Adequacy and appropriateness of project design
 - Sequence is appropriate for watershed conditions
 - Project proponent and their partners' experience and capability
 - Certainty that objectives can be achieved
- Cost Appropriateness (5 points possible)

APPENDIX C: 2004 SRFB Technical Criteria

Definitions: Benefits to Salmon and Certainty of Success

Fifth Round SRFB Grant Cycle

Identified & Prioritized in the Strategy	High Benefit Project Draft, Jan. 5, 2004
Watershed Processes & Habitat Features	Addresses high priority habitat features and/or watershed process that significantly protects or limits the salmonid productivity in the area. <u>Acquisition:</u> More than 60% of the total project area is intact habitat, or if less than 60% project must be a combination that includes restoration. <u>Assessment:</u> Crucial to understanding watershed processes, is directly relevant to project development or sequencing, and will clearly lead to new projects in high priority areas.
Areas & Actions	Is a high priority action located in a high priority geographic area. <u>Assessment:</u> Fills an important data gap in a high priority area.
Scientific	Is identified through a documented habitat assessment.
Species	Addresses multiple species or unique populations of salmonids essential for recovery or ESA-listed fish species or non-listed populations primarily supported by natural spawning. Fish use has been documented.
Life History	Addresses an important life history stage or habitat type that limits the productivity of the salmonid species in the area and/or project addresses multiple life history requirements.
Costs	Has a low cost relative to the predicted benefits for the project type in that location.

Identified & Prioritized in the Strategy	Medium Benefit Project
Watershed Processes & Habitat Features	May not address the most important limiting factor but will improve habitat conditions. <u>Acquisition:</u> 40-60% of the total project area is intact habitat, or if less than 40-60% project must be a combination that includes restoration. <u>Assessments:</u> Will lead to new projects in moderate priority areas and is independent of other key conditions being addressed first.

Areas & Actions	May be an important action but in a moderate priority geographic area. <u>Assessment:</u> Fills an important data gap, but is in a moderate priority area.
Scientific	Is identified through a documented habitat assessment or scientific opinion.
Species	Addresses a moderate number of species or unique populations of salmonids essential for recovery or ESA-listed fish species or non-listed populations primarily supported by natural spawning. Fish use has been documented.
Life History	Addresses fewer life history stages or habitat types that limits the productivity of the salmonid species in the area and/or partially addresses fewer life history requirements.
Costs	Has a reasonable cost relative to the predicted benefits for the project type in that location.

Identified & Prioritized in the Strategy	Low Benefit Project
Watershed Processes & Habitat Features	Has not been proven to address an important habitat condition in the area.
Areas & Actions	Addresses a lower priority action or geographic area.
Scientific	Is unclear or lacks scientific information about the problem being addressed.
Species	Addresses a single species of a lower priority. Fish use may not have been documented.
Life History	Is unclear about the salmonid life history being addressed.
Costs	Has a high cost relative to the predicted benefits for that particular project type in that location.

Identified & Prioritized in the Strategy	High Certainty Project
Appropriate	Scope is appropriate to meet its goals and objectives.
Approach	Is consistent with proven scientific methods. <u>Assessment:</u> Methodology will effectively address an information/data gap or lead to effective implementation of prioritized projects within one-to-two years of completion.
Sequence	Is in the correct sequence and is independent of other actions being taken first.
Threat	Addresses a high potential threat to salmonid habitat.
Stewardship	Clearly describes and funds stewardship of the area or facility for more than 10 years.
Landowner	Landowners are willing to have work done.
Implementation	Actions are scheduled, funded, and ready to take place and have few or no known constraints to successful implementation as well as other projects that may result from this project.

Identified & Prioritized in the Strategy	Medium Certainty Project
Appropriate	Is moderately appropriate to meet its goals and objectives.
Approach	Uses scientific methods that may have been tested but the results are incomplete. <u>Assessment:</u> Methods will effectively address an information/data gap or lead to effective implementation of prioritized projects within three-to-five years of completion.
Sequence	Is dependent on other actions being taken first that are outside the scope of this project.
Threat	Addresses a moderate potential threat to salmonid habitat.
Stewardship	Clearly describes but does not fund stewardship of the area or facility for more than 10 years.
Landowner	Landowners may have been contacted and are likely to allow work to be done.
Implementation	Has few or no known constraints to successful implementation as well as other projects that may result from this project.

Identified & Prioritized in the Strategy	Low Certainty Project
Appropriate	It is unclear how the goals and objectives will be met.
Approach	Uses methods that have not been tested or proven to be effective in past uses.
Sequence	May be in the wrong sequence with other protection and restoration actions.
Threat	Addresses a low potential for a threat to salmonid habitat.
Stewardship	Does not describe or fund stewardship of the area or facility.
Landowner	Landowner willingness is unknown.
Implementation	Actions are unscheduled, unfunded, and not ready to take place and has several constraints to successful implementation.

APPENDIX D: Proposed Habitat Project List Committee Evaluation Criteria for 7th Round (2006)

HOOD CANAL COORDINATING COUNCIL LEAD ENTITY

Habitat Project List Committee (HPLC) Project Ranking Criteria

The following criteria will be used by the Habitat Project List Committee (HPLC) to evaluate, affirm or re-rank the Tech Team's draft prioritized project list into the final prioritized list for submission to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB). The HPLC will not reconsider or use the technical criteria used by the Technical Team to assemble their draft list. The objective of the HPLC is to consider those non-technical factors of community impact, educational value and relative project cost.

These criteria have been taken from our local process over the past three funding rounds and are consistent with the direction of the SRFB towards consideration of socioeconomic factors of salmon recovery projects.

COMMUNITY IMPACT & EDUCATION ISSUES

- Does the surrounding community support this project? Who is that community and how can you substantiate that support?
- Is there any community opposition to this project? Who is opposed and how will you address that opposition?
- Does this project have any educational value? Who is being educated, what are they being educated about, and how can you substantiate that? Will this project educate the public and raise their awareness about salmon and habitat protection/restoration issues?
- Will this project receive any publicity/visibility? How and whose attention will it gain? Will publicity be helpful to salmon recovery efforts?
- Will this project elicit more support in the future? From whom and how?

PROJECT COST ISSUES

- Is this project expensive relative to other projects on the list? Is that expense justified? How did you determine the expense is justified?
- If this project is funded, will it bump other (or several other) good projects out of probable contention for funding, based on historical HCCC Lead Entity SRFB funding?
- Is this project appropriate for SRFB funding?

APPENDIX E: 2006 Lead Entity Groundrules

GROUND RULES Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) Process

The purpose of ground rules is to provide a framework for fruitful discussion and exchange that guides rather than constrains interactions and make explicit the common expectations with which the participants undertake the lead entity salmon recovery funding process and participate on the Hood Canal Coordinating Council (HCCC) Lead Entity Group. The Lead Entity Group is comprised of Project Sponsors, Technical Team (Tech Team) members, and the Habitat Project List Committee (HPLC). These rules describe the purpose of the process, the manner in which the several interests are structured for effective participation, the decision-making process, the responsibilities of the participants to one another and to the constituents, and the conduct for decision-making.

These ground rules are intended to facilitate discussions and salmon recovery efforts under the lead entity organization legislation (RCW 77.85). Should a conflict with that legislation arise from these ground rules, the legislation will prevail.

Participating in the lead entity process as a member of the Lead Entity Group signals an understanding and acceptance of the ground rules, as adopted by the Lead Entity Group. The ground rules are described below:

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of the Lead Entity Group is to collectively assess the portfolio of salmon recovery projects submitted to the Lead Entity and develop a final ranked project list for funding to the SRFB. The final ranked list must be consistent with the current salmon recovery plans for the Hood Canal & the Eastern Strait of Juan de Fuca, and the current funding cycle policies developed by the SRFB, including any changes or additions made to these documents that are pertinent to this cycle of funding.

II. DEFINITIONS

Conflict of Interest: A lead entity member that directly benefits from, or is significantly involved in the development of, a project.

Consensus: The explicit concurrence of all Lead Entity Group members. Consensus is defined as a decision that allows each member to say, "The group I represent can live with the decision and accept it, whether or not it is exactly what we want." While consensus is generally unanimous agreement on a topic, it can also include formal disagreement with the decision for the record, while agreeing to accept the majority decision. To achieve consensus, group members

typically try to address concerns and objections, make adjustments and concessions, rather than argue for their point of view.

HCCC: Hood Canal Coordinating Council

HPLC: Habitat Project List Committee. The HPLC is responsible for the final ranking of projects for funding request submitted to the SRFB using technical rankings from the Tech Team as their starting base. From there, the HPLC will use a set of criteria that incorporates social and cost factors, as well as linkage to the HCCC Salmon Habitat Recovery Strategy.

Majority: A majority, representing at least 51% of the total caucus, will rule voting decisions by the Lead Entity Group.

SRFB: Washington State Salmon Recovery Funding Board.

Tech Team: Members of the Technical Team responsible for ranking the projects based on an established set of technical criteria.

Voting member: Voting members on the Tech Team are those that sit on the Tech Team to evaluate projects based on established technical criteria. Voting members of the HPLC will be citizen members, and one project sponsor representing each sponsor group. A voting decision can either be through unanimous consensus or through majority vote. While members of the Tech Team will be present at the HPLC meeting, they are there only to answer clarifying questions, and will not vote on projects.

III. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITY OF THE LEAD ENTITY GROUP

- Team members agree the HCCC Lead Entity process is evolving each year, but that in the given year, the process is identified, set and cannot be changed mid-process.
- Team members will collaborate to establish a final ranked list of projects, consistent with the HCCC Summer Chum Salmon Recovery Plan and the Chinook Salmon Recovery Plan, as well as SRFB policies.
- Disagreement should be constructive and focused on the issues rather than on perceptions of motives or relationships and personalities.
- Everyone must have a chance to be heard. Side conversations are discouraged and should be taken out of the room if necessary. Questions are encouraged to solve problems or educate others. Team members are expected to state their interests and not just their positions.
- Team members should be sensitive of the length of their comments in order to encourage equal participation from the Team.
- Once the agenda is set, team members will stick to topic and time.
- The building block process is focused on earlier work, so the HPLC will use as a foundation the work and prioritization of the Tech Team.

IV. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITY OF THE FACILITATORS

- The facilitators are impartial individuals who guide the process.
- The responsibility of the facilitators is to keep the group focused on the agreed upon tasks, to suggest alternatives, and to encourage participation by all team members.
- The facilitators assist in the preparation of agendas, coordinate meeting logistics, and prepare the Lead Entity application to the SRFB.
- The facilitators will moderate the project sponsor presentations, provide support to the technical team and facilitate the HPLC meeting.
- The facilitators will adhere to these ground rules.

V. TECHNICAL TEAM MEMBERS

- Tech Team members will “score” projects based on a baseline set of criteria developed from the SRFB.
- Tech Team members will hold their results confidential until the draft preliminary ranked list is released to the Lead Entity Group. The specific individual technical rankings will not be released, nor will individual statements or comments by the Tech Team.
- Tech Team members are not representatives of a caucus and therefore hold impartial analysis of each project based solely on technical merit.
- In the event of a conflict of interest, either real or perceived, the affected Tech Team member will make their interest known to the rest of the Team and the group will determine by consensus that person’s level of participation in evaluating and ranking that project or set of projects.
- Tech Team members **cannot** participate on the HPLC.
- At least one Tech Team member will be present at the HPLC meeting to answer clarifying questions.

VI. HABITAT PROJECT LIST COMMITTEE MEMBERS

- HPLC members consist of citizens, and one representative from each project sponsor organization (excluding Tech Team participants).
- In the event of a conflict of interest, either real or perceived, the affected HPLC member will make their interest known to the rest of the Committee and the group will determine by consensus that person’s level of participation in evaluating and ranking that project or set of projects.
- HPLC members will develop a final ranked list of projects from the draft preliminary list, based on previously established criteria, largely focused on social and cost issues as well as linkage with the salmon recovery plans.
- HPLC members will not re-evaluate projects based upon technical criteria.
- The desire is for the HPLC to reach consensus on the final ranked list with the option of using majority vote on those issues for which consensus is not possible.
- Ultimate decisions of the HPLC are made by the voting member caucus and cannot be changed.

- At least one Tech Team member will be present at the HPLC meeting to answer clarifying questions.

VII. DECISION-MAKING

- Agreement on ranked project lists are by consensus or voting of the Tech Team and HPLC. It should be our intent to avoid voting however.
- At the HPLC, to move a project up or down on the list, an HPLC member must make a motion regarding which specific project is to be moved, specifically where on the list it is to be moved, and what the rationale is for moving that project (related to the previously stated review criteria).
- In the event of a tie vote, the particular motion to move a project up or down the list will not be approved.

VIII. AMENDMENT OF THE GROUND RULES

These ground rules may be amended by consensus of the members of the Tech Team, HPLC or Project Sponsors as the particular section pertains to them.

APPENDIX F: 6th Round Lead Entity Participants

HCCC Habitat Project List Committee Roster and Technical Team for the 2005 HCCC Lead Entity SRFB Funding Cycle

Technical Team Members

- Peter Bahls, Northwest Watershed Institute
- Richard Brocksmith, HCCC
- John Cambalik, Puget Sound Water Quality Action Team
- Lige Christian, North Olympic Salmon Coalition and Jefferson Cons. District
- Carrie Cook-Tabor, US Fish & Wildlife Service
- Dan Hannafious, Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group
- Steve Heacock, Kitsap Cons. District
- Jeff Heinis, Skokomish Tribe
- Randy Johnson, WDFW
- Thom Johnson, WDFW
- Ted Labbe, Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe
- Marc McHenry, US Forest Service
- Kathy Peters, Kitsap County
- Doris Small, WDFW
- Steve Todd, Point No Point Treaty Council
- Micah Waite, WA Trout

Citizen Volunteers

- Phil Best
- Vern Rutter
- Jerry Zumdieck
- Richard Wojt
- Tom Springer

Project Sponsors

- Al Latham, Jefferson CD
- Willi Smothers, NWI
- Marty Ereth, Skokomish Tribe
- Mike Jones, PGST
- Jamie Glasgow, WA Trout
- Ryan Dicks, CLC
- Neil Werner, HCSEG
- Anne Haines, GPC
- John Blankenship, PNWSC